
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3302851
60 St James's Avenue, Beckenham BR3 4HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs S and A Love against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/00643/FULL6, dated 14 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion with a full width dormer to the rear roof slope and raising the ridge by 200mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the pair of semi-detached houses and the area generally.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey, semi-detached house which is located within this residential area. The road contains a variety of house styles, mainly of semi-detached 2 storey design. The area has a pleasing sub-urban character and dates mainly from the inter-war period.
4. Although there are some different designs (the appellant identifies 6 different styles repeated along the road) there are a number of consistent themes; they are mostly 2 storeys, mostly semi-detached and have a consistent building line. As may be expected for buildings of this age, many have undergone some form of alteration or extension and many of these were visible to me at my site visit.
5. The appeal property has been subjected to a first-floor side extension which has a lower hipped roof over it but matching the original roof over this house and its attached neighbour. The proposal seeks to provide a gabled roof over part of the width of the roof which would rise to a raised ridge at the front and then extend as a flat-roof rearwards, over the proposed dormer. The lower side element of the roof would be hipped and meet the new side gable.
6. The Council identifies the increase in the ridge height and the increase in the bulk of the roof as having an unsympathetic appearance which would disrupt

the rhythm of the existing rooflines and would be out of character with the scale and style of the host dwelling when viewed in the context of the pair of semi-detached dwelling.

7. The proposed roof extensions with its combination of gable and a lower hipped roof abutting it would have a particularly awkward appearance. The gable would appear as a bulky feature due, in particular, to its continuation as a flat section as part of the proposed dormer. Taken in isolation, I consider that this represents poor design and would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. Combined with the small increase in the ridge height, I consider that the scheme as a whole would significantly disrupt the appearance of the pair of houses.
8. I have taken account of other alteration within the street, which I was able to see. Although the Council indicates that none has involved raising the ridge as is currently proposed, the appellant draws my attention to the existence of a similar example. Some extensions do not represent successful additions to the area and the presence of harmful development should not be used as a reason to add further such extensions to an area. Inevitably, the extension of individual homes has meant that few of the properties within the area retain the original symmetry that would have existed when they were constructed. I accept that the addition of sympathetic extensions which may reduce symmetry is not necessarily harmful and have been accepted by the Council in the past. However, the example before me would have a particularly disruptive effect due to its unacceptable appearance.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the building and wider area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019. I find that there are no matters which outweigh that conflict and so the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR